June 18, 1997 • 9:30 am - 11:30 am

US Department of Veterans Affairs • Room 975 • Des Moines US General Services Administration, Washington DC Indian Hills Community College, ICN Classroom #6, Ottumwa

Project Team Leads Attending

Jim Youngblood, Steering Committee Chair Norman Baker, Project 1 Linda Plazak, Project 1 Pam Johnson, Project 2& 3 Darlas Shockley, Project 4 Ron Amosson, Project 5 Mark Laurenzo, Project 7 Wayne Cooper, Project 9 Cynthia Eisenhauer, Project 10 Stan Kuhn, Project 11 Paul Wieck, Project 12 Dave Gannon, Project 13 Harold Templeman, Project 14

IowAccess Team

Harold Bowman, ICN Amy Campbell, SPPG Jim Day, ITS Henry Lai, GSA Bill Morgan, GSA Gina Noll, SPPG Tom Slater, SPPG

Steering Committee Update

Jim Youngblood thanked the project leads for attending the session, and asked project leads to attend the Steering Committee meeting on Thursday, June 19. The Steering Committee met briefly on May 20 to discuss their organizational role in lowAccess. Youngblood added that he is currently looking for a co-chair that is outside state government.

Citizen Information Network (Project 1) Issues

Project 1 is responsible for creating the overall support system for the Citizen Information Network (CIN). That responsibility includes addressing many of the overlapping issues that many project teams are encountering, such as security, standards, and authentication.

Matrix for Common Issues

Linda Plazak presented a matrix which identifies many of the overlapping issues -- and asked the team leaders to comment on this matrix. Plazak added that a glossary is attached to the matrix, to make sure that the issues are clearly defined. The Project Leads added the following:

Youngblood stated that this type of arrangement would be okay, if no RFP is necessary. If the universities and community colleges are competing against the private sector for the contract, the ruling would apply.

Youngblood encouraged project leads to contact SPPG staff if there are questions about potential conflicts -- and they will deal directly with the Attorney General's Office. Youngblood introduced Jim Day, from ITS. Jim Day has been assigned to help project teams develop their RFIs and RFPs.

Day offered technical and professional assistance to all leads in developing RFIs and RFPs. Day stated that he will need project leads to outline what they need in their requests for proposals.

• <u>Do we have to do an RFP to contract with a state university or community college?</u>

An agreement of some sort is needed, but project teams wishing to do this do not need to go through the RFP process. Day suggested that team leaders refrain from using RFIs.

Jim Day can be contacted at the following: 515/281-5061 (phone)

515/281-6137 (fax)

jday@max.state.ia.us (e-mail)

Review Steering Committee Expectations & Project Compliance

Youngblood reviewed the Project Summary Sheets that were faxed out to each individual project lead. These sheets will be used to summarize the project progress in relation to the June 9 deadlines, and highlight areas where the project plans need strengthening. Youngblood emphasized the need for project leads to be diligent in completing their plans and meeting established deadlines. The Steering Committee will get a full set of these summary sheets -- and project leads may be expected to comment on how they will address these areas of concern.

Project Team Reports

Project Team 1 (CIN Overall Support Structure)

The team has held their second meeting, at which they defined the scope of the project, reviewed the first draft of the work plan, and approved the budget. Linda Plazak and Norm Baker commented that they have had the opportunity to discuss the US Postal Service's platform and the lessons learned during their deployment. The team is making plans for a presentation by the Information Network of Kansas. Plazak and Baker stated that they have a well-balanced, diverse team that is ready to move quickly on the development of this network. The goal is that by October, 1996, an agreement will be signed with the group that will create the CIN.

Project Team 5 (Online Local Government Budgets)

Ron Amossen discussed the project team membership, and added that the team is comprised mostly of local and state budget specialists. A core group of state officials has been meeting since March to develop this plan -- and has succeeded in analyzing and flow-charting the current budget process. Joel Lunde has been appointed as co-chair, and the core group will continue meeting weekly and begun consulting with vendors. The core group had a meeting with local budget officials, and has scheduled their next team meeting for July 19. The team hopes to implement pilot projects in the fall (1997), receive its first evaluations on January 15, 1998, and allow for the first electronic budgets on March 15. A large part of the budget will be used to purchase hardware and software -- and security is a large concern.

Project Team 9 (STAWRS)

Wayne Cooper commented on the progress of Project Team 9, which is currently looking for a way to provide a single point filing system for wage and tax reporting. The private sector did not think a home page application would help existing businesses, but the team was very committed to the need for a seamless structure. The timeline will be difficult to meet -- with a January 1 implementation timeframe. There is the potential to use or convert existing software available from federal offices to speed up the process and reduce costs for software development.

Project Team 7 (Business License Information Center & Regulation Guide)

Mark Laurenzo stated that the planning process was moving forward steadily and that the team needs to firm up the scope of the project and connect with other projects where

applicable. The team has selected a renewal process for licenses administered by the Department of Commerce and for business start-ups as the focus of the project. The team will be looking at initial programming, and will be rounding out the project team with additional private sector representation. The team will initiate a large focus group and the budget, which is slightly over target, will be adjusted.

Project 12 (Automated Booking Station)

Paul Wieck stated that their planning process has benefited because this project has been in the works for several years -- and is now ready to be deployed as soon as equipment is available. The request for funding has been drafted, and the team is awaiting approval of another grant from the Department of Justice (\$165,000 State Identification Systems Grant). Wieck expects that the grant will be approved. The first phase of this project places electronic fingerprints and other information on a system that will be accessed at three remote test sights -- and connected with FBI database. The second phase of this project will use funds from a Department of Justice National Criminal History Grant (\$375,000) to link electronic mugshots to fingerprinting system. Once grant approval is solidified on these other two funding sources, the team will be ready to implement.

Project 10 (Electronic Commerce Business Plan)

Cynthia Eisenhauer stated that the project team completed their plan, and have identified several components of the plan. The team has sent out an RFI, and will meet July 3 to discuss the information received from the RFI. Based on these responses, the team will draft a workplan and budget. The project team has been appointed fully and includes members of both the private and public sector.

Projects 2 & 3 (Internet Trainings & Materials)

Pam Johnson commented on the focus of the pilot Internet trainings. The pilots will focus on the following audiences: 1) the public that has limited, if any, knowledge of the Internet; 2) front-line federal/state/local government workers that work directly with the public; 3) federal/state/local government managers that need to understand how the Internet can be helpful; and 4) staffers who are preparing information for web pages (unsure of this group's inclusion). The team is currently researching effective practices and methods for the pilots, and expects to contract with community colleges for the trainings and a university for the evaluation components. The second part of this project involves the development of an Internet awareness video at Arizona State University. ASU has been working with GSA for two years, and has been tasked again to develop a video or short series of videos on the uses of the Internet. ASU may also develop a CD/ROM training and construct a platform for this CD/ROM and Video to be offered online. GSA wants the team to provide input into the content and topics covered on this video, CD/ROM package. GSA would like to identify 5-6 topic areas.

Project 13 (Integrated MIS for Human Services)

David Gannon clarified the scope of the project -- to create an automated enrollment system. The team is struggling with evaluation tools -- they can't necessarily measure the success of the system based on how many people use it. They do not want to encourage an increased need for human services -- and they want to go beyond user satisfaction surveys. The team will contract with an entity for the design of the application, and will probably need to purchase a data base to store the information. The team will need help in designing a user-friendly interface, and find someone willing to host the service (i.e. another state agency or institution). The current budget reflects the need to find an agency that may have hardware

necessary to complete this project. The team expects use the Internet -- so most of the funds will be committed to creating the user interface.

Project 11 - Environmental Permitting

Stan Kuhn stated that he has appointed a co-lead for the project, Elizabeth Henderson from the lowa Department of Economic Development. The leads met last week with SPPG and ITS staff, and added three private sector members. The team will try to meet in the first two weeks of July, and will provide an overview of the permitting system. The team is currently working on a budget plan, and ITS has agreed to brief DNR department heads on lowAccess and how it is compatible with internal department priorities.

Project 14 (Uniform Data Reporting for Mental Health Services)

Harold Templeman stated that he has submitted a draft project plan and work plan, and added that the team would like to add one additional person to its membership (a county supervisor). The team includes persons with disabilities, local government officials that are involved in the delivery and funding of mental health services, private sector providers, and state officials. The team is now attempting to gage the degree of county interest in this project. The \$78,000 budget will only allow the team to do this project on a demonstration basis in 2-4 counties. The team's next meeting is July 24.

Project 4 (Internet Training Pilot)

Darlas Shockley discussed the progress achieved to date on setting up pilot projects in four counties for Internet access and training. The team has been assigned and engages a broad group public and private individuals. The team's next meeting is June 25, at which time the team will revise their plans based on Steering committee feedback. The team is ready to begin implementation in July.

Projects 6 & 8

Leaders from the GIS Team (Project 8) and Online Housing Team (Project 6) did not attend the meeting.

Staff Report -- Focus Groups and Survey

Tom Slater and Amy Campbell stated that staff is expecting to complete a telephone survey of businesses and the public (approximately 600 of each). These surveys are intended to solicit information that may be of use to the team, and to help demonstrate need for projects that provide the public with alternatives in communicating and conducting business with government entities. A series of public meetings will follow these surveys to gather additional information -- and market the lowAccess process. Finally, focus groups may be considered as a method of testing applications uniformly on various targeted audiences. The public meetings and survey will be completed by the end of July.

Campbell stated that the surveys will begin by establishing the person's level of technological sophistication and establish their willingness to use various applications. Finally, the survey will ascertain where they will feel comfortable accessing these services (at home, in the library, at the supermarket, at the post office, etc.) and what types of support they would like at the site (i.e. a person on site, a written manual, online help). Campbell asked project leads to comment on any additional information that should be included in the survey instrument.

 Pam Johnson stated that this information would be very helpful to Projects 2 & 3 -- and the sooner that information is gathered, the better.

- Cynthia Eisenhauer stated that the Electronic Commerce Business Plan project would have additional questions to include in the survey and focus groups -- but will not be able to give those to staff until they have hired a consultant. The issue project 10 is looking at is how to make people more comfortable with technology -- and expand their perceptions of what is possible.
- Wayne Cooper stated that his group would benefit from business community feedback -- but they would rather have the business community focus groups conducted after they have an application to demonstrate.

Campbell suggested the project leads consider a baseline survey, followed by a series of public meetings, and followed up later with a series of focus groups to test a variety of applications.

Youngblood adjourned the meeting at 11:15 am.